# Lacan Kritik Final

## 1NC Analysis

#### All metaphysical concepts only make sense in relation to a web of signifiers in constant differentiation with each other. Meaning is not a process that can be closed off because it is always contextual to context.

Van Haute, Philippe, Against Adaptation: Lacan’s “Subversion” of the Subject Translated by Paul Crowe and Miranda Vankerk 2002 // UH-DD

“**The signifier actively institutes meaning.** Language does not simply reflect reality; it is not the expression of a previously given order. **The reality in which we carry on our existence must**, on the contrary, **be understood** in a pregnant sense **as the effect of the order of signifiers.** In this context, Lacan points out that **signifiers are essentially determined** diacritically or **differentially.** In other words, **they signify** primarily **on the basis of their difference from other signifiers and not**, for example, **by referring to a non-linguistic reality.** Let us return to our example of the difference between “man” and “woman.” It is clear that **the signifier “man” only has meaning as opposed to the signifier “woman”**—for what could “man” mean without “woman”? **The signifiers** “man” and “woman” **receive further meaning from a complex network of references in which signifiers such as “human,” “animal,” and “plant,”** for example, hold a central place. **The meaning of a signifier is in the first place dependent upon the linguistic context of which it is a part.** Moreover, **the fact that a signifier only receives meaning from a complex network of signitive references immediately implies**, for Lacan, **that the meaning of a signifier changes according to the context in which it is taken up.** When an analysand says in an analytical session, Je vais à la mer (“I am going to the sea”), the analyst might hear, Je vais à la mère (“I am going to the mother”), basing her interpretation on other associations that the analysand has formulated in the course of this or other sessions. A second example can perhaps make the point somewhat clearer. Some years ago, for professional reasons, I opened a bank account in Holland, and the bank clerk asked if I had any “titles.” I replied that I did, but immediately added that I wanted to keep them in Belgium, where I was living at the time. The man looked at me strangely, and asked me if the “titles” were not valid in Holland. After a bit of talking back and forth, it turned out that he had meant academic titles, while I, because of my Belgian background, had understood “titles” in the sense of the French titres (“financial securities”).9 Just as the associative context determined the meaning of the signifier mer/mère (“sea”/“mother”) in the first example, so here the meaning of the signifier “title” changes depending on whether it is to be understood in an academic context or an economic one. **The production of meaning is thus in principle a process that cannot be closed off. There is no ultimate context that could**, as it were, **embrace all contexts and so bring the production of meaning to completion.**”

#### Since language structurally cannot close off meaning, every linguistic formulation leaves over something that falls outside of the symbolic order, or The Real. The Real also defines the pre-subject who is a being of needs that has yet to enter the order of signifiers.

Van Haute 2, Philippe, Against Adaptation: Lacan’s “Subversion” of the Subject Translated by Paul Crowe and Miranda Vankerk 2002 // UH-DD

“This notion of a “subject” that still swims in the stream of the pre-textual already allows us to some degree to address a second basic category of Lacanian thinking. We already know that the symbolic is the order of language and of the law. We also know that **language**, as a system of differentially determined signifiers, **does not allow for a closure of the production of meaning.** This implies that something is left out of every linguistic formulation, something that cannot be taken up in this order. **By definition, every linguistic formulation leaves over something that cannot be integrated into the order of the symbolic.** Lacan speaks in this regard of **the real**, which **structurally resists any recuperation into the world of meaning. By extension, the human being** simply **as a being of needs, prior to entering the order of signifiers, can also be called real.** The real must further be distinguished from what we usually understand by the term “reality”; this last category refers to the reality in which we carry on our everyday existence, and, as we earlier emphasized, that reality is essentially structured by the symbolic.”

#### The pre-subject as a being of needs simply seeks satisfaction. Once introduced into the symbolic order, it becomes a subject and can articulate its needs through language. But because language is structurally in a state of lack, its articulation opens the subject to a dynamic of desires beyond biology. At the same time, language is never transparent, leaving the subject continuously unfulfilled.

Van Haute 3, Philippe, Against Adaptation: Lacan’s “Subversion” of the Subject Translated by Paul Crowe and Miranda Vankerk 2002 // UH-DD

“**The human being as a being of needs** (∆) **cannot express its needs other than through language.** For in order **to satisfy needs we require the help of the Other, who will** herself immediately **interpret the utterances of the child in terms of the order of signifiers. When a child cries, the** mother **[first Other] says, “She must be hungry,”** “She needs a fresh diaper,” or “She is unhappy.” In the elementary cell of the graph this concatenation of signifiers is represented by the vector . In this context, Lacan compares the pre-linguistic subject that inscribes itself in language to a fisherman, who casts a fishing-line (the vector ∆.) into the world of language () and, as it were, “catches” a signifier (“the fish it hooks”).18 **The articulation of the needs is not**, however, **a neutral operation.** Rather, **language introduces a clear and articulated structure into the** more or less **confused sensations and feelings by which the needs at first manifest themselves.** Anyone who has followed a wine-tasting course knows that a significant part of the course content consists in learning to give a name to the various flavors that one tastes when drinking wine.19 Once one has this skill in hand, one very soon notices that the names rebound upon how and what one tastes. The wine connoisseur tastes more and tastes otherwise than the normal untrained person. Of course, the latter nonetheless also notices differences between different sorts of wine. However, the capacity to also be able to clearly articulate these differences in language gives the tasting a quality it did not possess of itself, and that cannot be derived directly from the immediate experience.20 According to Lacan, the expression of needs in the order of language and culture leads to a diversification and multiplication that cannot be entirely explained by biology. Similarly, for example, humans are not only in search of a sufficient number of calories in order to survive, and perhaps not even primarily so. One look at the menu of any restaurant suffices to confirm that the demand for food is very diversified, and goes far beyond the level of biological functionality. “∆” indicates the human being as a being of needs that seeks satisfaction; it indicates the pure movement of life. **In the first moment, this being wants nothing more than to return to the state that existed before the needs manifested themselves** (“the intention that tries to bury it—the signifier—in the mass of the pre-text”). **It simply** **seeks satisfaction.**21 **However, the being of needs unavoidably encounters language** (the vector ) along its way (“its free movement”), **which subsumes its needs in a dynamic that cannot be reduced to biological necessity** and often takes no account of it. Consequently, **the relation between language and body is characterized by an essential exteriority**. More specifically, the relation between these two orders cannot be thought of as a relation of expression; **the symbolic is not the translation of a pre-given natural order.** On the contrary, for Lacan **language is like an alien body that grafts itself onto the order of the body and of nature.**22 We now understand, further, why the two vectors of the elementary cell of the graph have a different direction, and why they cross each other twice (“the retrograde direction in which its double intersection with the vector occurs”).23 Language is not simply the extension of the world of immediate experience (“the stream of experience”) and of needs. The symbolic follows a peculiar dynamic, which cannot be derived from biological reality or from the immediacy of experience. Accordingly, the two vectors do not follow the same direction—rather they intersect one another. **By inscribing itself in language in this way, the being of needs becomes a subject. This subject, however,** is essentially a split or crossed-out subject that **can never coincide with itself** (). **As soon as the subject is marked by the signifier, every determination of it leaves a remainder**; the subject as subject of the signifier—and strictly speaking there is no other—never simply coincides with itself.This implies that access to the immediacy of the “stream of experience” is denied to the subject once and for all. As subject of the signifier, all the subject can do is to strive after this lost immediacy from within the order of language, and all it achieves by this is to re-establish its own partition (Van Haute 1998). The exteriority of language with respect to the body takes on an extra dimension; not only is language not the extension of the body, but the entry into the order of language must always be understood as a loss. This loss can be made up for in very different ways on the level of phantasy,24 but inevitably these can only refer to the idea of a fullness and immediacy that is no longer affected by the differentiating and fragmenting force of the signifier. We will now illustrate this idea further by way of the relationship between the body and the unconscious in Lacan.”

#### The AFFs prioritization of free speech assumes a liberalist notion of language where people can express themselves freely. The psychoanalytic tradition holds that language is not transparent and is ultimately grounded in lack and desire.

Douglas-Scott 99 PSYCHOANALYSIS, SPEECH ACTS AND THE LANGUAGE OF "FREE SPEECH" SIONAIDH DOUGLAS-SCOTT Res Publica VoI.IV no.1 [1998] // UH-DD

“The focus of this paper is an attack on a prevailing view of what, for want of a better description, I shall call freedom of expression. A traditional liberal justification of freedom of expression holds that not only does **freedom of expression** aid us in our search for truth but it also promotes certain key values such as individual autonomy and democracy (in that people should be able to decide for themselves which political and societal views should prevail). This, it **is suggested**, is **possible only if government does not censor certain viewpoints.** Ronald Dworkin spelled out the practical implications of this view when, attacking current legislation in Germany which makes it an offence to deny, approve of or belittle the crimes of the Holocaust, he wrote that "we must not endorse the principle that opinion may be banned when those in power are persuaded that it is false and that some group would be deeply wounded by its publication".3 A similar view is expressed by Wojciech Sadurski, who, in a recent review of Catherine Mackinnon's Only Words, criticises those, such as Mackinnon, who would seek to regulate hate speech and pornography in order to bring about equality, suggesting that such regulation would deny the "autonomy and individual responsibility of the hearers". The views of Dworkin and Sadurski, paradigmatic of a certain type of liberal position, have themselves not gone without criticism. There is now a growing body of criticism, in particular, of the near absolute strength of freedom of speech in the U.S.A. These critics hold that it is better to allow inroads into freedom of expression than to continue to permit the harm caused by certain verbal utterances. However, it is not the purpose of this paper to focus on a critique of the standard justifications of freedom of speech offered by those such as Dworkin and Sadurski, but rather to suggest an alternative approach. For one surprising feature of the debate over expression and controls on expression is that such debate should take place almost entirely within the terrain of liberal theory. Very little account seems to have been taken of the rich accounts given of speech and language in modern literary and psychoanalytic theory and philosophy of language.6 **The standard liberal approach has been allowed to occupy** virtually **the whole terrain of discussion over the function of speech and language.** Furthermore, **what is taken for granted** by this traditional approach **is that, free from state interference, people are able to express themselves freely, to find their own truth, attain greater self-understanding and so on**; and that, therefore, as much expression as desired should be permitted both in public and in private. **A fuller consideration** of the work done by speech shows that none of this is necessarily so. The views to be considered here **lead us to mistrust speech rather than to prize it as a means to** greater self-understanding or **truth.** They lead us to rebut the traditional presumption in favour of freedom of expression. Two areas of focus illustrate why this is so. First, a brief excursion into **psychoanalytic theory reveals a very different approach to speech and language.** **Initially, the psychoanalytic situation might seem to have something in common with the liberal paradigm of self-expression** and autonomy. For why is free, unconstrained speech ("the talking cure") so important in the context of an analytic session? Well, it is important in order to improve our self- understanding and **to explore our hidden depths and repressions, which will somehow come to light through speech, language and self- expression. But how disturbing then,** **if the very means which should permit this self-understanding - - language - - should not be the transparent** entity, the conduit, that we might suppose it to be. Work in **psychoanalytic** theory presents a very different view of language and speech from the traditional self-congratulatory liberal analyses of speech. The **focus is instead on how language performs, obfuscates, confuses and misleads us.** A strong reason for rebutting the presumption in favour of free speech comes specifically from the theory of language of Jacques **Lacan**, which **stresses the obfuscation of language and its grounding in desire and lack, rather than in its ability to describe the world successfully or in its ability to enable us to attain truth or autonomy.**” (29-31)

#### The impact is jouissance—the unconscious pursuit of an unattainable desire at all cost. Language does not follow a correspondence theory where a word describes a reality. Language is all metaphorical and substitutes itself for The Real. It is not based on correspondence but in circularity through differentiation with other signifiers. This infinite metonymy hollows being into desire.

Douglas-Scott 2 PSYCHOANALYSIS, SPEECH ACTS AND THE LANGUAGE OF "FREE SPEECH" SIONAIDH DOUGLAS-SCOTT Res Publica VoI.IV no.1 [1998] // UH-DD

“In contrast with the view of language outlined above, **Lacan does not suppose a correspondence between word and concept**, or signifier and signified. **Instead of** there being **transparency** or correspondence, Lacan claims **there is** a **disappearance.** How could this be? Because, according to Lacan, **signs presuppose the absence of the objects they signify.** Our **language stands in for objects—all language is in a way metaphorical, in that it substitutes itself for a direct wordless possession of the object itself.** Jacques Main Miller cites an example given by Lacan in his first seminar. 21 Lacan considered elephants. **The most significant thing to happen to elephants was something they were unaware of - - that the word "elephant" exists** and that, from the moment that word is introduced, elephants begin to disappear. **Language names things and thus murders them as full presences, creating an alienation between the word and the thing.** That is why Lacan said that "/e mot est la meutre de la chose".22 **The relation between word and object is** not a quiet co- existence, as correspondence theories would suggest, but instead **a relation of murder - - words replace things, and to such an extent that you enjoy words instead of things**-- Lacan's **"jouissance".** This conception of language, which focuses on the disappearance of reference, is not an entirely new invention of Lacan but owes something to Hegel. At the beginning of The Phenomenology of the Spirit Hegel proffers this example:23 I say it is daylight -- a true sentence. I write it down, but at this point the reference evaporates because, although the sentence remains at the same place, with the same meaning, when the day turns into night, this sentence which was true becomes false. The reference evaporates. Thus writing is always writing in the direction of an absence. This is how human language functions—by such a lack-- to point to the absence of the real objects that the signs designate. Words come to have a meaning only by virtue of the exclusion and absence of others. The Linguistic Chain of Symbolic Order Furthermore, **not only do words not simply reveal their meaning** for Lacan, **but instead they lead on to other words in a linguistic chain.** This is the meaning of what he terms symbolic order. **The symbolic order is a self-contained dimension grounded not in correspondence, but in circularity. A signifier is defined by other signifiers.** 24 This circularity is well-defined by Quine, 25 who asks, "What is an F?". The only answer is "An F is a G and so on." **This is the foundation of an infinite metonymy.** What is an F is a G. A G is something else and so on. **But this infinite metonymy is based on the primary metaphor that killed the thing -- an erasure. The correspondence theory of language is replaced by a creation theory of language, the first creation being a disappearance or lack of all things.** **Thus language is empty because it is an endless process of difference and absence. Instead of being able to possess anything in its fullness, one moves from one signifier to another, along a linguistic chain which is potentially infinite. This potentially endless movement from one signifier to another is what Lacan means by desire. Language**, says Lacan, **is what "hollows being into desire".** **To enter language is to be separated from** what Lacan calls **the real, that inaccessible realm which is beyond the reach of signification, always outside the symbolic order.** According to Lacan, this occurs when we are severed from the mother's body. The child then realises it is a separate entity from the world, signalling the distinction between self and Other. At this point the child has entered the symbolic order, language. After the Oedipal crisis, we will never again achieve this blissful communion between mother and child, even though we will continue to search for it. We have to make do instead with substitute objects, which Lacan calls the "object little a', with which we try to replace the mother's body and to fill the void at the centre of our being. We move along substitutes for substitutes, metaphors for metaphors. For language is a system of differences. The signifying chain of speech comprises the "rings of a necklace that is a ring in another necklace made of rings". 27 Nor is there is any transcendental meaning or object which will terminate this endless y e a r n i n g - apart from the phallus itself, the transcendental signifier, according to Lacan. But this transcendental signifier is not an object or reality but merely an empty marker of difference, a sign of what divides us from reality.” (36-38)

#### Vote negative to engage in analyst discourse. There is a key distinction between the object of desire and the object that causes my desire. The object that causes my desire prevents me from ever obtaining the object of my desire to its completion, further causing hostility in my subjectivity. Only the alternative can orient our agency around the metonymical drive of unconscious desires by prioritizing the infinite obstacles to desire itself.

McGowan, Todd. “Capitalism and Desire: The Psychic Cost of Free Markets.” iBooks.

“If **psychoanalysis** emerges out of the suffering that integration into the social order causes, it also **reveals how the subject’s satisfaction depends on the public world** that appears to thwart this satisfaction. This idea, as much as any other, forms the basis for psychoanalytic practice. Unlike philosophers like Descartes or Kant, Freud doesn’t believe that one can arrive at the truth of one’s being through private introspection. It is only when one is in public and talking to others that one reveals this truth. This is why others know us better than we know ourselves, even when we try to maintain a hidden inwardness that we reveal to no one. In order to interact with others, we must constantly pay attention not to what they say explicitly but to the desire that their words express in the act of concealing.20 **We constantly read the unconscious truth of those with whom we interact.** No amount of introspection can replace public interaction for the revelation of truth.Psychoanalysis eschews the possibility of self-analysis for precisely this reason. Although Freud claims to have performed a self-analysis, and even published the results, he doesn’t develop this as a general practice or possibility. In fact, Jacques Lacan calls Freud’s self-analysis the “original sin” of psychoanalysis. **Self-analysis is impossible because it remains within the domain of privacy, a domain predominated by narcissistic** illusion and imaginary **ideals.** Private analysis or **self-reflection always obeys the restrictions of consciousness and never allows the disturbance of the unconscious to manifest itself. We might go so far as to seek our unconscious introspectively, but it will always remain one step ahead of our conscious self-reflection.** A disturbance that we seek is never a disturbance. **In public interactions**, however, one often does encounter **the unconscious**. It **erupts all the time and forces us to engage in a constant quasi psychoanalysis of each other just to navigate our daily life.** **When we practice self-reflection, we pay attention to our conscious intentions rather than to the signifiers that we employ unconsciously. To psychoanalyze oneself is to fall further into one’s private self-deception. Psychoanalysis requires the analyst to act as the point of connection to the public world.** The lack of a face-to-face encounter in the psychoanalytic session is simultaneously an abandonment of private intimacy. **The patient speaks to a public and not a private desire.** This association of psychoanalysis with the public world places it at odds with the demands of capitalism. **The psychoanalytic session**—and this distinguishes it, more than anything else, from other forms of therapy—**occurs in a public space.** Even though psychoanalysts don’t typically go on television and give public accounts of their patients’ private lives, **the act of analysis itself is public in the sense that it publicizes what the patient would prefer to have remain private.** **In the act of analysis, the patient confronts a public and articulates its desire** through this confrontation. The analyst stands in for the desire of the public, and the subject discovers its desire through the encounter with this desire of the Other.21 **By assisting the subject in discovering and naming its own desire, psychoanalysis hopes to lead the subject to a changed relation with its object.** Subjects come to psychoanalysis without knowing the truth of their desire, and they leave, hopefully, recognizing that the satisfaction of desiring derives from the obstacle rather than from overcoming it. This is the recognition that the logic of capitalism spares the subject. The capitalist subject views the trauma of the public encounter as a temporary barrier on the path to an immersion in the complete satisfaction of privacy. The capitalist subject enters the public world—by, say, driving on public roads—in order to arrive at a shopping mall where it can purchase a potentially satisfying object of desire and then return to enjoy that object in private. Satisfaction, for the capitalist subject, resides in the private realm because this is a realm where one can have the object without the barrier that exists in public. **Psychoanalysis provides a different relationship to the object.** The capitalist subject imagines itself dissatisfied because it imagines itself constantly overcoming obstacles to arrive at the object, but in fact the obstacles are the object. **If the subject can recognize its satisfaction in its obstacle, then the public world undergoes a dramatic transformation.** Rather than seeking an object in this world and retreating with the object into one’s private oasis, one must embrace the public world as the site of the obstacle. Without the public qua obstacle, the subject would lose its ability to satisfy itself, which is why capitalism’s hostility to the public world itself is not sincere. But the subject has the ability to recognize the public obstacle to the realization of its desire as the source of its satisfaction.22 **The changed attitude toward the obstacle permits the subject to find satisfaction where it formerly saw only dissatisfaction.** The barrier to the satisfaction that capitalism posits transforms into the source of the satisfaction for the subject. **Satisfaction in the obstacle replaces an unending and dissatisfying pursuit.** The subject overcomes the constitutive dissatisfaction that capitalism requires by transforming the relation to the obstacle. The subject that finds satisfaction in the obstacle doesn’t fit well into the role of the capitalist producer or consumer. **Our desire moves metonymically from object to object without ever successfully obtaining satisfaction in the object that it seeks.** Each time that I obtain an object of desire, I quickly find this object dissatisfying and move on to another object. **This is because of the key distinction between the object of desire and the object that causes desire** (or what makes the object of desire desirable). **The object that arouses my desire is not the object of desire itself but what prevents me from obtaining this object, the barrier to an experience of the object’s complete abundance.**23 **Desire depends on the obstacle**, but the capitalist subject doesn’t recognize this dependence and instead imagines that the obstacle is only there to be surpassed. **This inability to recognize the necessity of the obstacle produces** the capitalist subject’s **hostility** to the public world, **which is the obstacle as such**, the obstacle that causes the subject to emerge. While adhering to the logic of capitalism, the subject doesn’t grasp the constitutive role of the limit. It is the difference between the Coke that I drink and the can that limits the amount of Coke that I have. This limit constitutes the Coke as desirable, and as a barrier, it functions as the object-cause of my desire. When I have the object of desire without the object-cause, without the limit that prevents me from fully having it, I cease to desire the object of desire, and it becomes a normal empirical object. If I could drink an unlimited amount of Coke at any time, I would simply cease to desire it.24 It is not only the can but also concerns about health, caloric intake, and propriety that serves as obstacles to this unbridled consumption. The fact that I would become obese if I drank two liters of Coke per day institutes even the desire for a small bottle. **The object-cause of desire—that is, the obstacle to the object of desire—renders the latter sublime and thus desirable.** But the capitalist subject remains blind to the constitutive role of the obstacle and thus remains resistant to venturing out into the public world where obstacles abound. **Psychoanalysis reveals**, in contrast, **that the subject’s satisfaction derives from the repetition of the failure to obtain the object, and the subject who recognizes the form of its satisfaction can see the necessity of the public world, which is the site of the subject’s original loss. The satisfaction of the subject does not reside in what it accumulates but in its repeated failures to accumulate.** Though the capitalist subject sees itself as avoiding repetition by moving from object to object, **this subject repeats the same trajectory without knowing it. Even though the object changes, the failure remains the same.** The capitalist subject, just like every subject, finds satisfaction in failure. It is just that the capitalist subject doesn’t recognize the form of its own satisfaction. But this misrecognition can have dramatic effects on the structure of the social order. We can see how the change in attitude toward the object turns the subject toward the public world at the conclusion of François Truffaut’s first feature, Les quatre cents coups (The 400 Blows, 1959). The film recounts the troubled youth of Antoine Doinel (Jean-Pierre Léaud), whose constant disobedience lands him in a reform school. Truffaut places Doinel and the spectator in a position of the capitalist subject: he seeks an object that he cannot find and encounters the intractable barrier of prohibition laid down by authority figures (his father, the police, and so on). In the final sequence of the film, however, Antoine undergoes a thorough transformation: a famous tracking shot follows him as he flees the reform school and runs down a long path toward the ocean.As Doinel arrives at the ocean, Truffaut turns the tables on the spectator with a closing shot that is almost unprecedented in its audacity. Rather than finding freedom at the shore or the realization of his desire as the spectator expects, Doinel encounters the ocean as an obstacle that forces him to turn back toward the public world he has fled throughout the film. In the final shot, Truffaut follows Doinel to the water’s edge, and the film ends with a freeze-frame of Doinel as he turns around and returns to the world. This is one of the key scenes in Truffaut’s filmmaking career because it clearly depicts the move from seeking the satisfying object to finding the necessity of the obstacle and its ramifications for the public world. **The subject that recognizes the necessity of the obstacle**, like Doinel at the end of Les quatre cents coups, **no longer flees the public but opens itself to the public world**, which is what Truffaut suggests with the turn back toward the world in the final shot. **This subject recognizes that there is nothing beyond the public world and that its satisfaction can only be found through this obstacle, not by escaping it.**” (169-181)

## 1NC Imaginary Ego

#### Their account of the body remains tied within liberalist notions of unity. The human begins in the opposite direction with a lack of coherence, incapable of controlling its body. Once capable of reflecting on its image, an egoistic sense of control arises but this is a fundamental misrecognition of our split between our lack of control and unity.

Markham 99 ,Mick Curriculum Inquiry, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1999), pp. 55-76 Taylor & Francis, Ltd. “Through the Looking Glass: Reflective Teaching through a Lacanian Lens”, // UH-DD

“**Unlike other animals, humans go through long periods of time when we are utterly incapable of existing without** our **caregivers. For years, we cannot even control our bodies enough to fulfill our basic needs.** During early infancy, **we experience our bodies only as disconnected and startling needs- pain, hunger, and the like. We have no sense of our bodies as whole, separate units; we slowly learn to distinguish our bodies from the rest of the world and to develop a unified concept of ourselves.** Now, Lacan notices that **from the age of about six months to approximately eighteen months, the human infant is fascinated by her own image in the mirror, to an extent that other animals are not.** Lacan theorizes that **this fascination** fascination **stems from our slowly coalescing mental images of our bodies. When an infant sees her reflection in a mirror, she sees a coherent and unified image—an image that contrasts with her own felt experience of her body. As the infant learns that this image is her own, she identifies with its reassuring unity.** She introjects the image, covering over any contradictory experiences of herself. Henceforth **she situates herself in relation to that image-or, more exactly, to a series of images that she introjects as representing herself. She constructs her ego entirely out of those images. Two** important **points emerge** from this theory. First, **human beings are split**, from the beginning, **between** a felt **lack of control and** a seen **unity.** Lacan sees this split (and other splits related to language and desire) as unavoidable-as partially constitutive of human beings. Second, although we paper over and hide these splits, **the unity of the ego is fundamentally a misrecognition.** The infant is never as whole, unified and controlled as her mirror reflection appears to be; and chaotic forces constantly threaten to return. These forces will particularly trouble the reflective metaphor. Lacan writes, "This illusion of unity, in which a human being is always looking forward to self-mastery, entails a constant danger of sliding back again into the chaos from which he started; it hangs over the abyss of a dizzy Assent in which one can perhaps see the very essence of Anxiety" (1953a, p. 15).” (63-64)

#### This split between lack of control and unity is the struggle between raw life and subjectivity. In result, we give into unity through signifiers which compensate for natural difference by drawing hierarchical distinctions of meaning, which turns case and is a net benefit to the kritik—only the alternative orients our agency around the incoherence of the symbolic.

Eugene de Klerk 10“White Curtains, Dark Thoughts” , English in Africa, Vol. 37, No. 1, Whiteness Studies: A South African Perspective (MAY 2010), pp. 41-62 // UH-DD

“It is necessary to examine in more detail, however, the effect of the gaze when it comes to race. Here it is helpful to consider what Lacan has to say about difference and logics of difference. Such a detour will also enlighten one as to why the unconscious Other is so compelling. Difference for Lacan is indisputable, insurmountable and, in fact, **culture and desire are always attempts to understand and compensate for difference.** However, it must be pointed out that **there is only one real difference** for Lacan: **that between organic being and meaning** (for him, **we are inevitably torn between raw life and subjectivity** [see The Four Fundamental Concepts 211]). **The subjective incarnation of the socio-cultural matrix** as authoritative presence (Other) **is a** salutary **reaction to** this **difference on the part of the child**; it is, in effect, an attempt to avoid having to navigate this trauma. **The subject unconsciously looks to the Other to provide the answer as to** how he or she might **successfully overcome this difference** (integrate being folly into meaning [see Lacan's seminar on Transference]). However, it is, in fact, according to Lacan, the subject who provides the answer (who selects - although often under duress - markers or **signifiers** which will **privilege certain instances of being and thereby afford the Other its 'answer' and** resultant **'identity'**).7 **The signifiers** 'chosen' in this way **will appear to make up** (make sense of) **the difference between being and meaning. They seemingly** emanate from the Other and **appear to the subject as the most desirable means for incorporating being into meaning** (the best way to Be). The answer 'received' by the subject in this encounter will, owing to its apparent ability to make sense of the experience of difference, generate a 'logic of difference.' **This logic will, in turn, found a system of inclusion (Being) and exclusion (non-Being) and generate a hierarchy of more or less meaningful beingness.** When analytically pressed or unveiled, however, **this existential touchstone will reveal itself to be arbitrary.**8 At base, **the experience of difference is and remains traumatically meaningless.**” (48-49)

#### The imaginary body ego trapped in the imagine of the symbolic becomes the way the material body is lived, so disad has the biggest concrete impact. There remains a fundamental gap between the imaginary body and the real body. Only the kritik can account for uncoded materiality

Christopher Breu, “Identity vs. Embodiment: A Materialist Rethinking of Intersex and Queerness” symplokē, Vol. 24, No. 1-2, Materialisms (2016), pp. 65-79 Published by: University of Nebraska Press // UH-DD

“To add to this list, I think we need to focus on embodiment as distinct not only from identity, but from all of these other dynamics as well. While it intersects with each of these dynamics it is important to emphasize embodiment in its resistance, intransigence, malleability, and agency. The advent of the material turn enables us to theorize this more fully, by refusing to merely see the body as a discursive production or as what Butler in 1994 called a process of materialization. **In the conception of the body** I want to argue for, **materiality isn’t just a passive site of** inscription or **construction, culture’s and language’s plaything, but also something that actively** intervenes, insists, resists, and **exerts agency. One way of theorizing** this form of **embodiment**, one I employed in Insistence of the Material, **is to use the** developmentalist **account of the real and the imaginary** in Lacan. **The imaginary body**, for Lacan, **is one that is produced by the** phantasmatic **mapping of the body** that takes place during the mirror stage. **This imaginary** body, or what Freud terms the **body ego**, is a phantasmatic construction, one that both **differs from the material body as it also becomes the way in which the material body is lived.** Thus, **the imaginary body can exist in contradiction with the material body, even as it provides the subject’s apprehension of the material body.**18 **The real body** in Lacan **functions as uncoded materiality. It is those aspects of the material body that elude or exist in tension with symbolization and imaginary mapping.** Such a conception of the real body would posit it as, to use Clough’s language in a different context, “an autonomic remainder.” Another way to posit a conception of **embodiment** that **exists in tension with language, culture and the symbolic**, would be to use Graham Harman’s speculative realist account of objects as withdrawn.19 What Harman means by this is that the “phenomenal reality of things for consciousness does not use up their being.”20 Such a concept then, whether using Lacan’s language, Harman’s language, posits objects (what I would want to define as material entities, in contradistinction to Harman, who oddly argues that his theory of objects is not a form of materialism) as always partially exceeding and in partial tension with any attempt at symbolic naming or conscious apprehen- sion. **Such an understanding of materiality in relationship to embodiment would always posit a tension and gap** (and perhaps a negative dialectic) **between identity and embodiment, the language by which we signify, understand, and construct our or others’ sense of embodiment as well as the material dimensions of embodiment itself.** I want to suggest a similar gap or tension also has to be posited between our actions on the body (including medical and scientific actions) and the materiality of the body itself. This gap isn’t a literal one, indeed medicine often impinges on the body in violent if also often necessary ways, but a conceptual one. It is the positing of a crucial disjunction a not all at the heart of any of our engagements with matter including the matter of the body. Levi Bryant helpfully casts this gap in the language of excess: materiality partly exceeds any attempt to apprehend, shape, control, or dominate it.” (72-73)

## 1NC Case

### 1NC Framing

omitted

### 1NC Link C/A

#### First Amendment discourse like the aff leads to a spark that justifies the alt-right agenda.

**RTM 15**, “Not Just Free Speech, but Freedom Itself,” 7 July 2015, https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/not-just-free-speech-but-freedom-itself.

“Despite the radical roots of organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union that advocate for state protection of free expression, this form of civil liberties empties the defense of free speech of any radical content, implying that only the state can properly guarantee our ability to express ourselves freely and thus reinforcing the power of the state above the right to free speech itself.”¶ Across the years, anarchists have defended freedom of speech. This is important in principle: in an anarchist vision of society, neither the state or any other entity should be able to determine what we can and cannot say. It’s also important in practice: as a revolutionary minority frequently targeted for repression, we’ve consistently had our speeches, newspapers, websites, and marches attacked.¶ Free speech fights have figured in anarchist campaigns for a long time. The Industrial Workers of the World fought restrictions on pro-union soapboxing by flooding jails until cities were forced to change their ordinances. Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman passionately defended free speech in the US during World War I and in the Soviet Union after the Russian Revolution. During the Makhnovist resistance in the Ukraine and the Spanish Civil War in Catalonia, anarchist forces distinguished themselves from authoritarians both left and right by refusing to restrict the press. More recently the SHAC 7 case, in which animal rights activists were defined as terrorists simply for running a website advocating direct action, showed that speech can still bring us into conflict with the state.¶ But anti-authoritarians aren’t the only ones who have taken up the banner of free speech. More recently, the right wing in the US has begun to argue[s] that the failure to give conservative views an equal footing with liberal views constitutes a suppression of their free speech. By accusing “liberal” universities and media of suppressing conservative views—a laughable assertion, given the massive structures of power and funding advancing these—they use First Amendment discourse to promote reactionary agendas. Supposedly progressive campuses reveal their true colors as they mobilize institutional power to defend right-wing territory in the marketplace of ideas, going so far as to censor and intimidate opposition.¶ Extreme right and fascist organizations have jumped onto the free speech bandwagon as well. In the US, Anti-Racist Action and similar groups have been largely effective in disrupting their events and organizing efforts. Consequently, fascists now increasingly rely on the state to protect them, claiming that racist, anti-immigrant, and anti-gay organizing constitutes a form of legally protected speech—and within the framework of the ACLU, it does. Fascist groups that are prevented from publishing their material in most other industrialized democracies by laws restricting hate speech frequently publish it in the United States, where no such laws exist, and distribute it worldwide from here. So in practice, state protection of the right to free expression aids fascist organizing.¶ If defending free speech has come to mean sponsoring wealthy right-wing politicians and enabling fascist recruiting, perhaps it is time for anarchists to reassess this principle.

#### Deriving rights from the Constitution, only allows the state to infringe on our rights for the sake of protecting itself.

**RTM 15**, “Not Just Free Speech, but Freedom Itself,” 7 July 2015, https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/not-just-free-speech-but-freedom-itself.

The Rhetoric of Free Expression¶ There appears to be a broad consensus in the US political spectrum in favor of the right to free speech. While opponents may quibble over the limits, such as what constitutes obscenity, pundits from left to right agree that free speech is essential to American democracy.¶ ¶ Appeals to this tradition of unrestricted expression confer legitimacy on groups with views outside the mainstream, and both fascists and radicals capitalize on this. Lawyers often defend anarchist activity by referencing the First Amendment’s provision preventing legislation restricting the press or peaceable assembly. We can find allies who will support us in free speech cases who would never support us out of a shared vision of taking direct action to create a world free of hierarchy. The rhetoric of free speech and First Amendment rights give us a common language with which to broaden our range of support and make our resistance more comprehensible to potential allies, with whom we may build deeper connections over time.¶ ¶ But at what cost? This discourse of rights seems to imply that the state is necessary to protect us against itself, as if it is a sort of Jekyll and Hyde split personality that simultaneously attacks us with laws and police and prosecutors while defending us with laws and attorneys and judges. If we accept this metaphor, it should not be surprising to find that the more we attempt to strengthen the arm that defends us, the stronger the arm that attacks us will become. Once freedom is defined as an assortment of rights granted by the state, it is easy to lose sight of the actual freedom those rights are meant to protect and focus instead on the rights themselves—implicitly accepting the legitimacy of the state. Thus, when we build visibility and support by using the rhetoric of rights, we may undercut the possibility of struggle against the state itself. We also open the door for the state to impose others’ “rights” upon us.

#### Free speech only exists when it’s weak and means nothing – clear and present danger test proves.

Ingber 84, Stanley THE MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS: A LEGITIMIZING MYTH, Duke Law Review, February 1984

The clear and present danger test presupposes that market imperfections sometimes give speakers an unacceptable level of advantage in influencing others. Because information opposing the speaker's viewpoint cannot be transmitted instantaneously to all market participants, the real market substantially departs from the theoretical one.80 Therefore, emergency situations are exempted from first amendment coverage. As long as sufficient time remains for the marketplace's process of deliberation to persist, however, and as long as lawless action is not imminent, no emergency exists and all speech must be protected. Yet the goal of free speech is not merely to have citizens enjoy participating in an effete truth-seeking process. Instead, citizens seek truth through free speech precisely to influence choice and behavior. Recognizing that beliefs are important primarily because those who hold them are likely to act accordingly, Holmes conceded that "every idea is an incitement. '81 Ironically, however, Holmes's "clear and present danger" formula allows government officials to prohibit expression precisely when such speech threatens to incite action.82 An interpretation of the first amendment that permits the state to cut off expression as soon as it comes close to being effective essentially limits the amendment's protection to encompass only abstract or innocuous communication. 83 Consequently, speech is constitutionally protected under the clear and present danger test as long as it is either ineffective84 or insignificant. 85 In either instance the test creates an establishment bias. Other factors peculiar to the clear and present danger test accentuate this bias. The test is both ad hoc and vague. Speakers receive no warning whether their contemplated speech extends beyond the parameters of constitutional protection. The test is totally contextual, giving little guidance to either the speaker or the official censor who must predict the impact of the expression. 6 For the speaker, this lack of notice fosters continuous uncertainty and thus may chill a risk-averse speaker who desires to minimize his personal legal peril.87 Such a person may censor himself by intentionally avoiding those messages he perceives as approaching the fringe of official acceptability. The official, in turn, must decide when the expression is clearly dangerous and when insufficient time exists for a full and fair hearing of responsive expression that would allow good counsel to defeat bad.88 The censor's evaluation involves a two-tiered decision. First, the official must evaluate the speech ideologically to determine whether it is good or evil, because if the speech is good the lack of sufficient time for response is irrelevant. 89 But under the market model, only the marketplace can accurately separate good from evil; therefore, no criteria can exist to determine whether speech is sufficiently evil to warrant exclusion from the market. Second, the official must calculate the seriousness of the speech's evil, because the market requires greater response time for more serious evils. This requirement forces the official to differentiate without any guidelines between evil counsel that is about to lead an insufficiently educated public astray, and good counsel that merely has convinced an adequately informed public of its "rightness." Under a test with such elasticity, speakers who proclaim any radical political doctrine may expect to receive little or no protection because they will always appear as a threat to the nation and, thus, embody the most serious of all possible evils. 90

### 1NC Advantage

#### Fighting speech with speech obscures material violence that students of color face.

Bennett Carpenter 16 is a graduate student of Duke in the literature department. “Free speech, Black lives and white fragility.” The Chronicle. January 19, 2016. <http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/2016/01/free-speech-black-lives-and-white-fragility>

As I write my first column, I am thinking a lot about speech. I am thinking about how an urgent and overdue conversation about racism—on our campus and across our country—has been derailed by a diversionary and duplicitous obsession with the First Amendment. I am thinking about how quickly the conversation has shifted from white supremacy to white fragility—and how this shift is itself an expression of white supremacy. White fragility refers to a range of defensive behaviors through which white people (or more accurately, people who believe they are white) deflect conversations about race and racism in order to protect themselves from race-based stress. Because white people tend to live in environments where whiteness is both dominant and invisible, they grow accustomed to racial comfort, as a result of which even a small amount of racial stress becomes intolerable. This helps explain why talking about white supremacy can feel more painful to white people than white supremacy itself, why the ostensible "stifling" of debate can feel more pressing than the literal strangulation of Eric Garner and how "free speech" seems more important than Black lives. Needless to say, it requires an astounding degree of narcissism, ignorance and— yes—fragility to scan headlines detailing the daily, state-sanctioned slaughter of people of color and somehow conclude that speech is the real problem. White fragility weighs the minimal discomfort of being confronted with painful realities about race and racism against the literal death of Black and brown bodies and decides that the latter matter less than white discomfort. Which is how we end up here, talking about speech on campus and reading a dozen iterations of the same editorial in which students describe—with utterly unintentional irony—how being called out by anti-racist activists makes them feel upset and hurts their feelings. This leaves those of us committed to abolishing white supremacy in a double bind. To engage with this debate is to fall for a diversionary tactic in which we again center the conversation on white feelings. To refuse to engage grants the latter a monopoly on the airways, drowning out more vital issues in an ocean of white noise. Still, in the interests of the open, honest debate the free speechers ostensibly advocate, let me try to address the constitutional and philosophical principles at play here. The first point to make is that, despite the hand-wringing, I have yet to see a single example of student activists violating the First Amendment. Indeed, it is hard to imagine how they could do so, given that the latter proscribes government abridgment of speech while student activists are private citizens. Many seem to confuse "free speech" with some banal notion of civility, forgetting that the very freedoms they invoke to defend racist drivel permit anti-racists to respond—whether by calling someone out or calling for their resignation. This would seem to set up a nice equivalence between racists and anti-racists—both exercising free-speech freedoms, which must be equally and indiscriminately defended. What this ignores, however, is the centuries-long history of racialized oppression to which hate speech contributes. Hate speech is thus both violent and an incitement to further violence. The courts already prohibit walking into a crowded theater and shouting "fire." How is this any different from walking into a white supremacist society and shouting racial slurs? It has become almost a truism that there is no hate speech exception to the First Amendment. Historically speaking, this is inaccurate. As M. Alison Kibler details in her "Censoring Racial Ridicule," the U.S. has a long history of regulating forms of speech that expose racialized groups to "contempt, derision or obloquy." Indeed, as recently as 1952, the Supreme Court upheld an Illinois law applying the standards of libel (another free-speech exception) to hate speech. It is only in recent years that the courts have, as the National Center for Human Rights Education puts it, "privileged white racists to express themselves at the expense of the safety of African-Americans and other people of color." Key to this new interpretation is a firm separation between speech and action, a legal variant on the old childhood adage: "sticks and stones may break your bones, but words will never hurt you." The problem—as anyone who has been the victim of hate speech can tell you—is that this simply isn't true. Words hurt as much as actions; indeed, words are actions. Within the context of white supremacy, any distinction between a defaced poster, a racist pamphlet and legal or extralegal murder can be only of degree.

#### Hate speech causes psychological violence and internalized hatred. Even if speech codes don’t decrease hate speech, codes stop the impression that hate speech can go unpunished.

Delgado and Stefacic 09, Richard Delgado - University Professor, Seattle University School of Law; J.D., 1974, University of California, Berkeley. Jean Stefancic – Research Professor, Seattle University School of Law; M.A., 1989, University of San Francisco. “FOUR OBSERVATIONS ABOUT HATE SPEECH.” WAKE FOREST LAW REVIEW. 2009. <http://wakeforestlawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Delgado_LawReview_01.09.pdf>,

II. OBSERVATION NUMBER TWO: THE EVALUATION OF HARMS HAS BEEN INCOMPLETE One way, of course, to end the current standoff is for one of the parties to defer to the other’s point of view. Indeed, by pursuing an aggressive campaign of litigation, the free-speech camp has been implicitly urging that the other side do just that.58 One could also argue that a host of campus administrators, by enacting successive versions of hate-speech codes, are attempting to do the same thing, namely, wear the other side down.59 Ordinarily, though, it is the free-speech faction, with a string of lower-court victories to its credit, who urge the other side to “get over it” and toughen its collective hide.60 Yet, a careful weighing of the costs and benefits of speech regulation suggests that the case for it is closer than the ACLU and some courts seem ready to acknowledge. Before addressing the costs of hate-speech regulation versus the opposite, it is advisable to arrive at an understanding of what hate speech is. A Types of Hate Speech **Hate speech**, including the campus variety, can take a number of forms—direct (sometimes called “specific”) or indirect; veiled or overt; single or repeated; backed by power, authority, or threat, or not.61 One can also distinguish it in terms of the characteristic— such as race, religion, sexual orientation, immigration status, or gender—of the person or group it targets.62 It can isolate a single individual (“Jones, you goddamned X.”) or group (“The goddamned Xs are destroying this country.”). It can be delivered orally, in writing, on the Internet, or in the form of a tangible thing, such as a Confederate flag, football mascot, or monument.63 It can be anonymous, as with graffiti or a leaflet surreptitiously placed on a bulletin board or under a dormitory door, or its author can be plainly identified.64 The object of the speech may be free to leave, or trapped, as in a classroom or workplace.65 B. The Harms of Hate Speech **The various forms of hate speech present different kinds and degrees of** **harm**. The face-to-face kind is the most immediately problematic, especially if the target is not in a position to leave and the one delivering it possesses the power to harm. 1. Direct or Face-to-Face Hate Speech Although some courts and commentators describe the injury of hate speech as mere offense,66 the harm associated with the face-toface kind, at least, is often far greater than that and includes flinching, tightening of muscles, adrenaline rushes, and inability to sleep.67 Some **victims** may **suffer psychosocial harms**, **including** **depression**, **repressed anger, diminished self-concept, and impairment of work or school performance**.68 Some may take refuge in drugs, alcohol, or other forms of addiction, compounding their misery.69 2. Hate Speech and Children With children, the harms of hate speech may be even more worrisome. A child victimized by racial taunts or browbeating may respond aggressively, with the result that he or she is labeled as assaultive.70 Or, the child can respond by **internalizing** **the harm** and pretending to ignore it. **Robbed of self-confidence** and a sense of ease, such a child can easily become introspective and morose.71 If the child’s **parents** suffer the same fate at work, they may **bring** these **problems home** so that the parents retain even less energy for their families than before.72 Recent scholarship points out how the **pathologies** **associated with social subordination may** **be transgenerational, lasting for centuries**, if not millennia, **and include pain, fear, shame, anger, and despair**.73 3. General Hate Speech With general hate speech, such as anonymously circulated flyers or speeches to a crowd, the harms, while diffuse, may be just as serious.74 Recent scholarship shows how practically every instance of genocide came on the heels of a wave of hate speech depicting the victims in belittling terms.75 For example, before launching their wave of deadly attacks on the Tutsis in Rwanda, Hutus in government and the media disseminated a drumbeat of messages casting their ethnic rivals as despicable.76 The Third Reich did much the same with the Jews during the period leading up to the Holocaust.77 When the United States enslaved African Americans and killed or removed the Indians, it rationalized that these were simple folk who needed discipline and tutelage, or else bloodthirsty savages who resisted the blessings of civilization.78 When, a little later, the nation marched westward in pursuit of manifest destiny, it justified taking over the rich lands of California and the Southwest on the ground that the indolent Mexicans living on them did not deserve their good fortune.79 Before interning the Japanese during World War II, propagandists depicted the group as sneaky, suspicious, and despotic.80 It is possible that the connection between general hate speech and instances of mass oppression may not be merely statistical and contingent, but conceptual and necessary.81 Concerted action requires an intelligible intention or rationale capable of being understood by others. One cannot mistreat another group without first articulating a reason why one is doing it—otherwise, no one but a sadist would join in.82 Without a softening-up period, early steps toward genocide, such as removing Jews to a ghetto, would strike others as gratuitous and command little support. Discriminatory action of any kind presupposes a group that labors under a stigma of some kind.83 The prime mechanism for the creation of such stigma is hate speech.84 Without it, genocide, imperialism, Indian removal, and Jim Crow could gain little purchase.85 C. The Harms of Speech Regulation If the harms of hate speech are sobering, what lies on the other side? What happens to the hate speaker forced to hold things in? Will he or she suffer psychological injury, depression, nightmares, drug addiction, and a blunted self image?86 Diminished pecuniary and personal prospects?87 Will hate-speech regulation set up the speaker’s group for extermination, seizure of ancestral lands, or anything comparable?88 The very possibility seems far-fetched. And, indeed, regimes, such as Europe’s and Canada’s, that criminalize hate speech exhibit none of these ills.89 Speech and inquiry there seem as free and uninhibited as in the United States, and their press just as feisty as our own.90 What about harm to the hate speaker? The individual who holds his or her tongue for fear of official sanction may be momentarily irritated. But “bottling it up” seems not to inflict serious psychological or emotional damage.91 Early in the debate about hate speech, some posited that a prejudiced individual forced to keep his impulses in check might become more dangerous as a result.92 By analogy to a pressure valve, he or she might explode in a more serious form of **hate speech** or even a physical attack on a member of the target group.93 But studies examining this possibility discount it.94 Indeed, the bigot who expresses his sentiment aloud is apt to be more dangerous, not less, as a result. The incident “revs him [them] up” for the next one, while **giv[es]**ing **onlookers the impression that baiting minorities is socially acceptable**, so that they may follow suit.95 A recently developed social science instrument, the **Implicit Association** Test (“IAT”), shows that many Americans harbor measurable animus toward racial minorities.96 Might it be that hearing hate speech, in person or on the radio, contributes to that result?97

#### Reverse enforcement is empirically denied- FBI studies prove

**Delgado and Yun 94** [Richard Delgado - Charles Inglis Thomson Professor of Law, University of Colorado. J.D. 1974, University of California, Berkeley. David H. Yun – Member of the Colorado Bar. J.D. 1993, University of Colorado. “Pressure Valves and Bloodied Chickens: An Analysis of Paternalistic Objections to Hate Speech Regulation.” California Law Review. 1994]

B. The "Reverse Enforcement" Argument A second paternalistic argument is that enactment of hate speech rules is sure to hurt minorities because the new rules will be applied against minorities themselves.61 A vicious insult hurled by a white person to a black will go unpunished, but even a mild expression of exasperation by a black motorist to a police officer or by a black student to a professor, for example, will bring harsh sanctions. The argument is plausibile because certain authorities are racist and dislike blacks who speak out of turn, and because a few incidents of blacks charged with hate speech for innocuous behavior have occurred. Nadine Strossen, for example, asserts that in Canada, shortly after the Supreme Court upheld a federal hate speech code, prosecutors began charging blacks with hate offenses. 62 But the empirical evidence does not suggest that this is the pattern, much less the rule. Police and FBI reports show that hate crimes are committed much more frequently by whites against blacks than the reverse. 63 Statistics compiled by the National Institute Against Violence and Prejudice confirm what the police reports show, that a large number of blacks and other minorities are victimized by racist acts on campus each year.' Moreover, the distribution of enforcement seems to be consistent with commission of the offense. Although an occasional minority group member may be charged with a hate crime or with violating a campus hate speech code, these prosecutions seem rare.6 5 Racism, of course, is not a one-way street; some minorities have harassed and badgered whites. Still, the reverse-enforcement objection seems to have little validity in the United States.
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#### DOUGLAS-SCOTT:

PSYCHOANALYSIS, SPEECH ACTS AND THE LANGUAGE OF "FREE SPEECH" SIONAIDH DOUGLAS-SCOTT Res Publica VoI.IV no.1 [1998] // UH-DD

“This conception of language, which focuses on the disappearance of reference, is not an entirely new invention of Lacan but owes something to Hegel. At the beginning of The Phenomenology of the Spirit Hegel proffers this example:23 I say it is daylight -- a true sentence. I write it down, but at this point the reference evaporates because, although the sentence remains at the same place, with the same meaning, when the day turns into night, this sentence which was true becomes false. The reference evaporates. Thus writing is always writing in the direction of an absence. This is how human language functions—by such a lack-- to point to the absence of the real objects that the signs designate. Words come to have a meaning only by virtue of the exclusion and absence of others.” (36-37)
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## Notes

#### VAN HAUTE 1

-difference component – derrida – it’s all based on differentiation – signifiers are things that give meaning – they are based in differentiation with each other

-if it’s the case it’s based on differentiation, it’s based on circularity – concepts based on difference to other concepts- they’re not trying to describe the real- the gap is between

-detached from the real – real difference component

-real is defined as outside of the symbolic- thigns like man and woman – social concepts are based on difference- actual phenomentla experience- man and woman are artificial concepts- not the real conditions

#### VAN HAUTE 2:

-cannot close of meaning

-important: since it’s about diffentiation, part of it’s articulation- based on parts of the real- famous lacanian- symbolic doesn’t capture the read- tree example- symbolic word- based on diffentiation- it leaves over certain particularities- my language- I saw a tree does not tell you type. The real- escapes the symbolic

-always be a lack

-Lacan presubject- infant who hasn’t entered the structure as real- he calls it a state of affect- pain hunger- need for restroom- there’s no symbolic structure- anything – incoherent space- calls the real- animals could coun

#### VAN HAUTE 3:

-language is in lack- capture real- presubject- predicated on needs that have to be fulfilled-

libidinal economy

needs, commands, desires- framework interaction- needs are constraints- subjectivity- still have to go to sleep-

-infant as r4eal articulates needs under real- you only want satisfication- articulate through symbolic structure- never articulate needs

statre for desire- product ofr lack-

deleuze- lacn/ natural suppression- lacan- desire is a product of symbolic- needs are articulated through language- desire 2 different ways- language- encoded in things beyond needs- how to differently- social concpets of food etc. myriad of difference

it is not transparent- never fully articulate what you really need

-humans – no satisfying way to affect expression

#### DOUGLAS-SCOTT:

-liberalism speech- assumes speech can be free absent government interference

-psychoanalytic- assumes free

douglas speech/psychoanalysis- liberalst notion- if it’s the case we have spills of tongue then we sould foster space- exercise – poses the question- no clarity or truth- it is itself the thing that’s lacking

-distinction of function vs idea- but more on the function-

\_fruedian speech unconscious- liberalst paradigm

#### DOUGLAS-SCOTT 2:

-think it as following from Van Haute 3

-link is more established

goes back to issue of difference- if concepts re based on different, they’re based on circularity

correspondence- assumes when I say something ,th world articulates reality-

lacan- signifiers determined by difference- man not describing reality- this is all metaphors

original world- metaphor for real- kills subject- differentiation on other words- metaphorical- web of signifiers- where they are tied together- or in relation to another

make sense in another snese of each other- circularity- infinite affirming concept- another concept- nmyriaad- concepts.

New word creation example- creating a word kills concept- substitutes for real- differentiaton

-desire of attinable- impossible desire- its joussance

desire intintie- language- chain ARG-

functionalists- individuality was a thing- there would be no change in ideas- specgrum- level of difference

evolution of ideas as well: functionalirt paradigm- infinite chain

#### MCGOWAN:

McGowan, Todd. “Capitalism and Desire: The Psychic Cost of Free Markets.” iBooks.

-psychoanalysis- patient engage in their own creation

beings are structured language- ontologuy pursues joussaince

to understand the desire- we understand lack is important to desire

any other orientation- pursuing the desire

miserable – lack- simply indicates capital logic- consumption is more and more- accept